



PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

07

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS  
425 Eye Street N.W.  
ULLB, 3rd Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20536

JAN 08 2003

File: EAC 00 069 51011 Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER Date:

IN RE: Petitioner:  
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Petition for a Nonimmigrant Worker Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act,  
8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(L)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

Identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER,  
EXAMINATIONS

*Myra L. Rosenberg*  
for Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition and a subsequent motion to reconsider were denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center. The matter is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a manufacturer that seeks to employ the beneficiary temporarily in the United States as a technician. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that the beneficiary had been employed in a specialized knowledge capacity or that the beneficiary possesses specialized knowledge.

On appeal, counsel argues that the petitioner explained in its motion that this is a legally valid position. Counsel states that the director has adopted a policy of blanket denial of cases from China and that this is unlawful on its face, in restraint of trade and discriminatory on the basis of national origin. Counsel further states that this policy can and will be challenged in a court of law should the AAO fail to take corrective action.

8 C.F.R. 103.3(a)(1)(v) states in part:

*Summary dismissal.* An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

As the petitioner has failed to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

In visa petition proceedings, the burden of proving eligibility for the benefit sought rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not sustained that burden.

**ORDER:** The appeal is summarily dismissed.